DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 098 995 IR 001 386

AUTHOR De Hart, Florence E.
TITLE The Library-College Concept: For the Want of a Horse Shoe Nail.
INSTITUTION Kansas State Teachers Coll., Emporia. Graduate Library School.
PUB DATE Dec 74
NOTE 55p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$3.15 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Higher Education; *Independent Study; *Individual Instruction; Instructional Materials Centers; Librarians; *Library Education; *Library Material Selection; Library Role; Library Services; University Libraries
IDENTIFIERS *Library College

ABSTRACT

The library college concept is a teaching method which differs from traditional methods in that librarians and faculty work more closely together in carrying out course objectives and tend toward a convergence in role or a symbiotic relationship. In the spring of 1967 an upperclass course in library materials was taught using this method at a small university. The course plan included brief lectures, assignment of a research project, talks by library staff members, conferences with librarians, presentation of class reports, and open-book tests. Small difficulties and inconveniences, mostly arising from the lack of time and other resources, threatened the successful implementation of the library college concept, but the concept was found to be promising with respect to increasing student involvement and enthusiasm. It was concluded that librarians will begin to play their role in implementing the library college concept when they become aware of the efforts on the part of the faculty in this regard, and that implementation of the concept will reveal so much basic worth that its eventual theoretical development will pose no problem. (Author/PF)

EMPORIA KANSAS STATE COLLEGE
School of Library Science

ED 098995

The Library-College Concept: For the Want of a Horse Shoe Nail

Florence E. De Hart

For want of a nail
  The shoe was lost,
For want of a shoe
  The horse was lost,
For want of a horse
  The rider was lost,
For want of a rider
  The battle was lost,
For want of a battle
  The kingdom was lost,
And all for the want
  Of a horse shoe nail.[1]

Part I: The Library-College Concept

This is a story of a kingdom called the Library-College Concept. This concept is defined here as a teaching method which differs from traditional methods in that librarians and faculty work more closely together in carrying out course objectives and tend toward a convergence in role or a symbiotic relationship.[2] Some advocates of the concept even recommend the complete merging of the roles of librarian and professor into one individual. The library-college concept need not be associated only with colleges officially designated as library-colleges, which apply the concept throughout the curriculum, but may be implemented, at least in part, in any other type of academic institution.

Further characteristics of the library-college concept as a teaching method are as follows: a closer relationship between students' library activity and classwork; student-initiated inquiry and student involvement; practical relevance to the world, according to the nature of the subject; and, if prop-

IR001 386

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

erly implemented, enthusiasm. Ideally, the library supporting implementation of the concept is a learning resources center, including all types of materials, facilities for creating new materials, source lists for speakers and field trips, study carrels, on the job training services, and any other appropriate personnel and equipment related to teaching and learning. In addition, more extensive bibliographic service is provided for both students and faculty than is traditionally provided.

This story is recorded so that all would-be inhabitants of the Library-College Kingdom may share the insights gained from the experiences of one professor, named Rider, who was lost in the rhyme for want of a horse, in attempting to implement the library-college concept in an upperclass course, Library Materials, during the spring, 1967, semester in a small university. There was no known immediate readiness on the part of the university administration or the library staff to implement the library-college concept, even in part.

Previously, Rider had managed to "cover" the material within the two credits allotted to the course, but students demonstrated little genuine understanding of the subject, in spite of their grades, and less love for it. They did not see the course as a related whole. There is no available documented account of any of the traditional offerings of this course, however. Rider then resolved to use the library-college approach, combining within himself the roles of profes-

sor and librarian. This approach seemed to have the potential for developing within the students a greater ability to cope with problems pertaining to library materials, which ability the students would hopefully draw upon in their future work as librarians. The nineteen students were given questionnaires to fill out at the end of the semester to evaluate the course; seventeen were returned.

One such study as this cannot, of course, provide sufficient data to warrant generalization. However, so little is known about implementation of the library-college concept that related hypotheses are difficult to formulate without insights which can only be gained from actual attempts at implementation of the concept. The insights gained from this experience are presented, therefore, as suggested hypotheses for further study, to be refined by others who similarly attempt to implement the library-college concept, in different courses, in various other academic institutions.

The moral of this story - the major thesis derived from the semester's experiences - may be paraphrased from a thesis of Bernier relative to information services and systems:[3] It has been postulated that library-college advocates lack theory and perhaps confidence. They are challenged by the problems inherent in implementing the library-college concept, for example, attitudes of faculty and librarians, testing and grades, commuting students, and conflicts with traditional methods of teaching.

This lack of theory, including the absence of precise def-

inition of the concept, is said to be a cause of confusion and disagreement among those devoted to this area of educational innovation. The central thesis derived from the semester's experiences with the Library Materials course is that the major threat to successful implementation of the library-college concept lies not in the lack of a general theory, but in the lack of properly allocated resources for operations supporting traditional methods of teaching, which operations play an even greater part in implementing the library-college concept than they play in the use of traditional methods. Thus, successful implementation of the library-college concept, with its requirements for additional allocated resources, is threatened by the weak foundation of improperly allocated resources supporting traditional teaching methods on which implementation must rest. The difficulties and inconveniences arising from factors no bigger than a horse shoe nail, which are subjects of improper allocation of resources, threaten, in their cumulative effect, to turn implementation of the concept into an obstacle course.

Further general theses produced by the semester's experiences, however, predict that implementation of the library-college concept, even when necessarily conducted as an obstacle course, will reveal so much basic worth in the concept that its eventual theoretical development will pose no problem; that librarians will begin to play their role in implementing the concept when they become aware of efforts on the part of faculty

in this regard; that scattered attempts by faculty to implement the concept will make wide ripples in educational waters; and that if widespread implementation of the concept fails, it will fail only for the want of a horse shoe nail.

The objectives of the Library Materials course, to which the library-college concept was applied, were as follows, and are expressed in terms of desired learning outcomes: (1) Familiarity with the literature of the subject and effective use of the literature in gaining understanding of the subject; (2) Some ability to select materials (of all kinds, in all subject disciplines) and to handle the technical aspects of ordering; and (3) Some ability to perceive and analyze problems relevant to library materials, such as the problem of censorship.

The structure of the course took the following form: (1) An overview of the subject, including mention of key concepts and relevant problems, was presented by Rider. (2) Students formed themselves into groups responsible for initiating the definition of a broad acquisitions problem which would have reality in actual library situations and for seeking solutions to it. Each member of the group was responsible for discussing one aspect of the problem in both a written and an oral report. Students reported on their plans in class and received pertinent comments and criticisms from fellow class members. A written progress report was required near midterm. (3) Three

library staff members and one outside speaker addressed the class. A few short lectures were presented by Rider. These talks concentrated on key concepts of the subject, each of which pertained to every, or almost every, aspect of each problem, or on types of libraries other than the school library, which latter type overwhelmingly captured the interest of the class. Students visited libraries individually and in groups and had conferences with the librarians. Some also had conferences with librarians on the staff of the University Library, and all had conferences with Rider, in which they received bibliographic guidance. (4) Prior to midterm, students submitted an outline of their reports and an annotated list of the three most helpful items found in the University Library relative to their topics. These outlines and bibliographies were reproduced and distributed to the class and the items placed on reserve in the University Library. (5) Reports were presented and discussed. Three open-book tests were given with questions derived from the class presentations and discussions, the readings, and the text, which served as background reading for the course, but which was not used as a text according to the traditional concept of textbook use.

In attempting to implement the library-college concept in this Library Materials course, Rider sought insight into the following specific questions and their solutions:

1) To what extent do students and faculty need bibliographic service, defined here broadly to include guidance and assistance of any kind in both

finding and evaluating material? What is the nature of the service which they require? In what form might it be provided?

2) What are the roles of librarians and faculty in providing bibliographic guidance for students, including teaching students the process itself of finding and evaluating materials?

3) How can professors implement the library-college concept in their courses, in colleges not designated as a library-college, and in which there is no known immediate readiness on the part of the college administration or the library staff to implement this teaching method, even in part?

   a) If professors simply begin to incorporate the library-college concept into their teaching, will librarians gradually become openly committed to the concept and assume their appropriate role?

   b) In the meantime, can professors effectively play the roles of both professor and librarian in implementing the library-college concept?

Experiences throughout the course relative to these questions will be cited. Based on the insight into the implementation of the library-college concept derived from these experiences, conclusions concerning each question will be presented, which conclusions serve only as suggested hypotheses for further study, to be refined through the experiences of others in attempting to implement the library-college concept in many different situations.

Following are the conclusions relative to the first question concerning bibliographic service which were drawn from the semester's experiences with the course. These conclusions are significant for the reason that they came out of these experiences; in themselves, they are not new.

With respect to extent of need for bibliographic service on the part of students and faculty, the need is so great that it invalidates the statement found here and there in the literature that there would be no shortage of professional librarians if the clerical work they are doing were given to clerks. In reality, there would remain a frightening shortage of professional librarians.

In spite of one library science teacher's reaction, upon hearing that library science students were receiving bibliographic guidance, - "Now I've heard everything!" - the semester's experiences corroborated a statement made by Clarence Leuba that the student does not have the background to select and evaluate his educational materials,[4] and a finding reported by Patricia Knapp that the student's concept of finding what he needs in the library is not that of his instructor.[5]

Ironically, criteria for evaluating material, taught in the Library Materials course, were of little help to the students in compiling their own bibliographies. Most of the authors' names which they encountered meant nothing to them. They were at a loss, by and large, to judge the accuracy or soundness of the material and were thoroughly confused by contradictory statements made by authorities in the field. The two items pertaining to bibliographic guidance on the questionnaire, on which students expressed the greatest need for additional help, were attacking the problem initially and evaluating

the material which they found.

Contrary to the apparently widespread view that faculty members who would admit needing librarians' help in keeping up with their field are lazy or incompetent, faculty members, too, have a great need for bibliographic service. In spite of Rider's thorough knowledge of the library as a bibliographic whole, without the vantage point of the librarian, described later in the section on role, he found that there were many practical difficulties involved in keeping himself informed of all the retrospective and current material relevant to his interests, including all topics treated by his students, from books, journals, indexing services, abstracting services, government documents, vertical file material, learned society reports, research reports, reference works, and nonbook material, including all forthcoming publications announced in any of these sources which he might want the University Library to acquire.

Rider could possibly keep himself thus informed - he could also possibly draw up his own will, treat his own case of virus, or design his own suit of clothes, but he should not have to lose either his time in doing so or the benefit of professional assistance - not when there are lawyers, doctors, designers, and librarians whose specialty it is to perform these functions. Professors do need more extensive bibliographic guidance in the form of appropriate reader services, such as compiling annotated bibliographies and providing a current awareness service,

and owe no apology for this need to librarians, administrators of academic institutions, or fellow faculty members, who, through false pride, feel obliged personally to check all possible locations in the library periodically for material in their field. On the contrary, faculty should make their needs for additional bibliographic service known to librarians, and librarians should fulfill them. Mastery of the library as a bibliographic whole, including provision of reader services reflecting this mastery, is the librarian's professional specialty.

The analysis of the nature of the bibliographic guidance which was required by the students in this course reveals a most interesting implication relative to the roles of librarians and professors in providing bibliographic guidance for students. The students' need for guidance in acquiry, defined as the process of finding material, could not be separated neatly from their need for guidance in inquiry, defined as the evaluation of the worth and relevance of the contents of material to the question under consideration.

Finding material depended upon an analysis of the student's chosen problem; knowing whether a "find" had been made depended upon an evaluation of the significance of the item to the problem; and the "find" which prompted a restatement of the problem, or a refinement of the outline, redetermined the process of acquiry. Bibliographic guidance given to students by librarians is usually associated with acquiry; that

given by professors with inquiry. The fact that, by the very nature of the bibliographic guidance required by students, acquiry and inquiry are Siamese twins strongly suggests that the roles of librarians and professors in providing this guidance should move toward convergence, with involvement of both in guiding students in inquiry as well as acquiry.

The nature of the bibliographic service required by Rider also has implications for the roles of librarians and professors in implementing the library-college concept. Rider had engaged in the typical professorial activity of building up a bibliography, on cards, with evaluative annotations, for use in giving students bibliographic guidance in this course. In addition to the need for help in adding appropriate retrospective material to this bibliography, his greatest need was for some means by which librarians might have kept him informed of all incoming material, of all types, bearing both on the course in general and on all topics treated by the students, whether this material bore a recent date or was a valuable retrospective work, in a manner more efficient than his own efforts were able to be in this regard.

A concomitant need was for some means by which librarians could have helped him get his hands on appropriate incoming items in order to digest them before students got hold of them, other than by overspending the department's allocation of funds for using the Xerox machine. Now and then, after Rider had gotten hold of an incoming piece, students in the mean-

time had caught wind of its availability and set out on its trail. The sight of Rider running after the material and the students running after Rider at times rivaled that of the three blind mice chasing the farmer's wife.

In what form might bibliographic service be provided for students and faculty? An obvious means of providing bibliographic guidance for students is use of the conference. Rider had more conferences with students, alone and in groups, during this course than he had with students in any other course, and felt that as much, or more, learning took place through the conferences as in the classroom. The chief value of these many conferences was this: they revealed that students did not see things bibliographically the way Rider thought they saw them. Since there is some indication that being able to see things as students see them is a key to superior teaching,[6] much more extensive use of student conferences is essential.

It was in scheduled conferences that two bright students explained independently of each other their reason for not using Library Literature, after they had been told over and over what it was and where to find it. They had assumed that Library Literature was the same thing as Readers' Guide. As one put it, "All through school we've been told that Readers' Guide is the key to periodical literature, never anyplace else, and I assumed it was the same thing."

And it was in unscheduled conferences that two other stu-

dents, independently of each other, burst into the office to share with Rider their newly gained insight into the difference between library organization and the path for finding things which winds through the literature itself. As one said, "You can't just go to the card catalog - there are a whole lot of other ways to find things. From the materials themselves, one thing leads to another. And the headings in the card catalog aren't set up the way I need to look for things for my report."

Other forms in which bibliographic service should be given to students, and to faculty as well, are through a current awareness, or SDI (selective dissemination of information) service, with a delivery service to faculty offices, student carrels, and mailboxes (large enough to hold materials) of commuting students. Faculty need for a current awareness service, more extensive and systematic than the informal current awareness service presently provided by librarians who watch for material on topics of known interest to certain professors, has been pointed out above. Rider attempted to provide such a service for his students, in some cases with annotations. He browsed with a gleam in his eye among shelves of incoming, uncataloged, and unchecked-in materials, in the Learning Materials Center, which houses the library science collection and materials supporting the education curriculum, from which shelves items were made available to students through Rider at his request.

Does SDI work against the educational goals of teaching students how to search for their own materials and how to be receptive to the inspirations of serendipity in the process? Consequently, is SDI harmful to students? Perhaps. But Rider suspected that the inadequacy of the extent and quality of the search which students were able to make for themselves among all types of incoming material for information pertinent to their topics was at least equally harmful to them.

The idea of provision of an SDI service in an academic situation has appeared in the literature in recent years, at intervals, in connection with machine use, but without accompanying deep concern about the appropriateness of this service for students or faculty, which concern was expressed frequently to Rider when he provided a homegrown current awareness service to selected faculty members a few years ago.[7] Do we cease to worry about the appropriateness of a service when machines are involved? Already in 1966, the ACRL News described a contemplated library program, called INTREX, which "could take a much more active role in providing information to its clientele than is now possible," including selective dissemination.[8]

A recent recommendation, with reference to SDI for public libraries, contains a philosophy basic to the establishment of a current awareness service and should be accepted for academic libraries: "...It seems apparent that the use of technical services to support reader services is an area

which public libraries can and should continue to explore actively."[9] The organization of materials in the academic library should be regarded as a reader service and done in combination with providing reader services, so that responsibility for both input and output resides in the same job position, whether or not machine use is involved.

A delivery service to faculty offices, student carrels, and mailboxes for commuting students should accompany the current awareness service. To belabor the obvious for a moment, this is not a recommendation that browsing be discarded in the library-college concept, with the opportunity it provides for finding an unexpected treasure next to the item being sought. Whether delivery service need be an either-or proposition - students and faculty using the service become so lazy that they cease coming to the library entirely - remains to be proved. One librarian who offered delivery service for faculty in a university library for five years maintains that "this service to faculty INCREASED their use of the library directly considerably."[10] However strong the case may be for coming to the library, there were occasions throughout the semester when Rider found that a delivery service would have been a practical and sensible aid to both students and faculty.

All seventeen of the questionnaire returns indicated that students would have found it helpful to receive a systematic

current awareness and delivery service, described briefly in the questionnaire. Another question asked whether students would have found it desirable to receive a package of material on their topic early in the semester, which would have constituted the bibliography for preparing their reports, without their having to search for or evaluate this material themselves. Contrary to the affirmative response to the question about a current awareness service, students answered that they would not have desired to receive such a package of material early in the semester to constitute their bibliography. Students evidently saw a distinction between such a "package" service and the current awareness service, which latter would still require evaluation of material on their part.

The plot thickens, however, when answers to still another item on the questionnaire are considered: the question of whether students found any useful material by accident, such as while they were looking for something else, and to what extent this happened. Eleven claimed that this did happen, six with great frequency, two fairly frequently, and three somewhat. Whether serendipity is normally a considerable factor in bibliographic activity, and to what degree students can be taught to be receptive to its inspirations, are questions in need of further exploration. Or did this rather high "accident" rate simply mean that students' search procedures were so ill-defined that their success in finding material had to

reply partially on accident?

Following are the conclusions, relative to the roles of librarians and faculty in providing bibliographic guidance for students, including teaching students the process itself of finding and evaluating materials, which were drawn from the semester's experiences. Rider had asked one of the best students in the class to comment generally to him in his office on the library-college concept, explaining that the roles of librarians and faculty would tend toward convergence or possibly complete merger. This student commented, "I used several other libraries to find material on my topic. Three librarians in different libraries didn't know what Library Literature was and made me feel that I was interrupting them when I asked about it. And teachers can be unbelievably dull and uninterested in teaching. If you are going to combine these with librarians, this," said the student in solemn sincerity, "could be a hopeless combination."

Preferring to forget the student's comment, Rider concluded that the roles of librarians and faculty in implementing the library-college concept must tend toward much greater convergence, but both roles should not be played by one individual. Librarians should assume the role of materials specialists, working in close collaboration with faculty as a teaching team, in guiding students in both acquiry and inquiry, according to the librarians' subject specialties. Faculty

should assume the roles of teaching specialists with a specialty in the development of objectives, content, methodology, and evaluation, working in close collaboration with librarians as a teaching team. Librarians would also play a part in curriculum development since course objectives, content, and structure bend under the weight of ideas in new materials. It should be emphasized that playing these specialist roles full-time is entirely different from playing the role of librarian part-time and that of professor the remainder of the time.

Are these the same roles librarians and faculty have claimed all along, but never really played, or are these new roles?

The librarian's role must remain distinct for two reasons, which were brought home to Rider in a very practical way throughout the semester: First, the nature of a library collection militates against merging the roles of librarians and professors into one. The library is more than an aggregate of materials on various subjects. It is an organized, bibliographic whole. There are many entrance points into a collection which lead to material on any one subject, involving both the library's ways of organizing material, such as the card catalog, and the bibliographic structure within subject fields themselves. This concept has been set forth clearly in the writings of Patricia Knapp. Mastery of a library collection, including the acquisition, organization, and retrieval of material, and the ability to teach the use of a collection constitute a specialty which should be handled by a specialist in a full-time role.

Second, certain practical problems follow, as outgrowths of the nature of a library collection, which make the merging of both roles into one impossible. The fact that Rider holds the doctorate in library science was irrelevant to his attempt to function as both librarian and professor throughout the course. He was not able to begin to provide bibliographic service comparable to the contribution librarians could have made in this regard, from their vantage point of (a) selecting, handling, organizing, and retrieving materials of various types as a full-time specialty, (b) seeing the overall picture of the availability of materials, especially with respect to overlapping fields, (c) being physically located at the point where materials come into the library to be integrated into the collection, and (d) operating within an administrative structure which permits the establishment of necessary work routines and time schedules, thus avoiding chaos and anarchy, and which eliminates librarians' having divided responsibility for and giving divided attention to two different roles.

When Rider provided a current awareness service for selected faculty a few years ago, the process was an efficient one, and time required for providing the service was not judged to be a problem.[11] Material for several different subjects was searched for simultaneously in appropriate sources. Library of Congress cards, when available, were not sent to faculty, but rather homegrown citation cards, many of

which were annotated. This time, however, when Rider, in the role of professor, attempted to provide a current awareness service for students, he was unable to do more than a haphazard job, because he lacked the vantage point which he had when he functioned solely as a librarian. This recommendation pertaining to role holds also for the future, even though materials will most likely come with perforated current awareness cards ready to be reproduced.

Discussion of roles of librarians and faculty in implementing the library-college concept would be incomplete without consideration of the roles of the other staff members essential to a learning resources center: A-V specialists, who create new materials as needed, such as transparencies; in-service training specialists, who serve as consultants to members of the teaching team and aid them in conducting research relative to teaching and learning; and the nonprofessional, defined broadly here as anyone without the education usually required for librarians and teachers in institutions of higher learning. The work of in-service training specialists will be particularly vital until programs of education for librarians and faculty include the library-college concept in appropriate areas of their curricula.

Teaching is a unified process. Rider, like any other teacher, necessarily planned all aspects of his teaching as a unified operation centered around fulfilling certain objectives. He would have liked conveniently to be able to sit down with

a team consisting of an in-service training specialist, a librarian, and an A-V specialist in preparing his work. All specialist functions ministering to teaching should therefore reflect, in their objectives and location, the unity of the teaching process.

As it was, there was no officially designated in-service training specialist on campus. Although part of the Instructional Media Services was housed in the library building, the unit which created new nonbook material was in another building. Rider was referred to a student there whose job was to create and prepare transparencies expressing concepts which professors wished to convey to their students by this means. Although this student was highly artistic, no professor should be referred to a student without first having been referred to an A-V specialist as a matter of course, to obtain any creative ideas which he may have on how the material to be made might best reflect the purpose for which it is being designed. Whether a conference with an A-V specialist would have prevented the following disappointment with the work done by the student is a matter of conjecture: the librarian in the transparencies was depicted as the typical little old lady with glasses and bun!

The question of the role of the nonprofessional in implementing the library-college concept was raised by the level of service provided by the clerk in the Learning Materials Center. This clerk, a high school graduate with no previous

library experience, had not been employed in the Learning Materials Center very long, and undoubtedly knew nothing about library functions, much less the library-college concept. However, without any request from Rider, this clerk provided the following special services rather consistently and very well throughout the semester, and especially over the spring vacation when there was no professional librarian on duty in the Learning Materials Center: kept watch for materials on topics which she knew Rider's students were working on; drew to Rider's attention material which she considered would be good background reading for the course; charged out and delivered wanted items to Rider's office (although located in the Center, this service was still very helpful); and informed Rider of appropriate incoming items not yet cataloged, or, with respect to journals, checked in, and made them available to Rider and his students.

Until bibliographic guidance has been provided jointly by librarians and faculty for a reasonable length of time, it will be difficult, if not impossible, to analyze the levels of work which are best performed by professionals and nonprofessionals. Certain of this clerk's activities might well be retained by nonprofessionals; others would undoubtedly be performed more expertly by librarians. Her service philosophy, personality, and attitudes, however, should be characteristic of the attributes held by all professional, as well as nonprofessional, personnel.

The final question will now be treated: How can professors

implement the library-college concept in their courses, in colleges not officially designated as a library-college, and in which there is no known immediate readiness on the part of the college administration or the library staff to implement this teaching method, even in part? With respect to the method of professors' simply beginning to use this teaching method, there was some indication that the librarians in the University Library associated with the study would gradually become openly committed to the concept and assume their appropriate role.

The nineteen students had twenty-six conferences with eight different librarians on the staff of the University Library. Rider had mentioned casually to the librarians that the students would be approaching them and described in general the type of questions they would be asking. Student reports concerning the conferences indicated that bibliographic guidance beyond that ordinarily provided had been given to the students in a number of cases; some librarians had guided them in both acquiry and inquiry. On speaking later with certain of these librarians in reference to the conferences, Rider found that the librarians did not consider that they had done anything out of the ordinary, and, in fact, gave the impression that working with the students had been the making of their day. Whether or not the reaction of these librarians was a typical one to the efforts of a professor to implement the library-college concept must be determined, of course, by

further testing in many other situations.

With respect to the question of whether professors can effectively play the roles of both librarian and professor in implementing the library-college concept, experience with the course indicated that both roles can be played, but not as effectively as possible, for the reasons listed above, in the section on role, which militate against a complete merger of the roles of librarians and faculty.

Part II: The Horse Shoe Nail

The major deterrent against providing effective bibliographic service, however, was the cumulative effect of difficulties and inconveniences relative to factors extrinsic to the essence of the library-college concept and each no bigger than a horse shoe nail, which, in their cumulative effect, turned the attempt to implement the library-college concept into an obstacle course. It should be noted, in line with the major thesis of this paper, that all of these difficulties and inconveniences presently hamper operations which support traditional methods of teaching, which operations play an even greater part in implementing the library-college concept than they play in supporting traditional teaching methods. Consequently, successful implementation of the concept is threatened by the weak foundation on which it must rest.

Some of these factors, for example, that of time, may appear to be of major, rather than minor, consequence. However,

time for implementing the concept is totally irrelevant to the theory, or essence, of the approach. In the perspective of its extrinsic relationship to the substance of the library-college concept, time must be viewed as a horse shoe nail. Insufficient time for implementation in no way supports or invalidates the basic worth of the concept and tells nothing about the major question of whether this teaching method fulfills course objectives more effectively than traditional teaching methods.

Two caveats must be set forth immediately before these small difficulties and inconveniences are described. First, concern for these small factors may be viewed with opposing attitudes. According to one attitude, all factors basic to implementation of the library-college concept, no matter how small, should be given painstaking attention, so that bibliographic guidance may be provided in the smoothest possible manner. According to the opposing attitude, consideration of these small factors is picayune, and librarians, faculty, and students should be able and willing to cope with them if they are sufficiently committed to implementation of the library-college concept. This paper subscribes to the first attitude.

Second, the description which will follow of the difficulties and inconveniences encountered in no way implies criticism of the University Library associated with the study, or the many academic libraries which may recognize themselves through the description. There is not one of these factors of

which the University Library staff was unaware nor for which they were not battling in the face of odds, as is undoubtedly the case with respect to the many other academic libraries which might just as well be the one described. Already short of clerical staff and student assistants, the student assistant budget was sharply cut the semester during which the experiment took place, intensifying certain of the difficulties and inconveniences.

The first nail, bearing directly on staff shortages, is the problem of available time for librarians and faculty to implement the library-college concept, in view of the present shortage of both library and teaching staff to carry out adequately traditional library and teaching functions. Librarians and faculty must have ample time to confer together as a teaching team. In addition, conferences with students are time-consuming, needless to say, even with the prospect of shortening required classroom hours under full implementation of the concept. In spite of repeated invitations to stop by the office, students are not likely to appear for many conferences in either librarian or faculty offices with desks piled high, telephone ringing, steady interruptions at the door - with every indication that professional activities and publishing leave little time for students. A librarian friend of Rider reports a recent reduction in his library work week from thirty-five to thirty hours. If this should be the start of a trend in library working hours, there will be an even greater

shortage of librarians to staff reader service areas every hour the library is open.

An even greater problem might be simply to get both librarians and faculty to recognize that members of the other group are presently truly busy. Might the following experiences be typical? When Rider left full-time librarianship to go into teaching, a teacher commented to him, "Oh, so now you're going to work for a living!" Conversely, the librarian whose library work week was reduced, replied, upon being informed that in one state, the average work week of professors in the state's public universities is currently fifty-four hours,[12] "If they are putting in a total of fifty-four hours, they must be wasting a lot of time, for with the small number of teaching hours per week, if they spent all that other time preparing, studying, etc., they would not only be geniuses but would be producing intellectual giants by sheer osmosis."

The second nail has to do with required class time, which will be reduced in full implementation of the library-college concept. This remaining required class time should be left intact, however. Rider found that the loss of class time during the semester, which would have posed a problem even with traditional teaching methods, was disastrous in attempting to implement the library-college concept. On two different occasions, one third of the students left in the middle of class to attend a required conference for future stu-

dent teachers, concerning which Rider had received no advance notice. A third evening, half of the class session was given over to a convocation of all library science students. For the first three weeks of the course, there were heavy absences because of the weather. How the weatherman can be induced to cooperate in implementation of the concept might make a challenging research topic. Nevertheless, the quality of the student-initiated inquiry in coverage of topics suffered in the early part of the course as did the schedule of student reporting in the latter part, not as a consequence of the group approach per se but as a result of the six disrupted class sessions.

Meeting only once a week was also a detriment. The students' choice of the three most helpful items in their bibliography, unable to be revised by students according to Rider's suggestions because of the need to get the list to the Reserve Department before the passing of another week, was at times surprisingly poor. Some convenient way for teachers to reach students outside of class, such as through mailboxes, has to be provided. On questioning a few students about their choices, however, Rider received this explanation, containing a pedagogical lesson: Although one or more of the choices did not appear to deal directly with the problem, they supplied the students with elementary background material, which was indirectly related, and gave them a needed frame of reference within which to attack the problem.

The third nail deals with library hours, the inadequacy of which was a problem for commuting students, as would be expected, since they require a greater choice of library hours to accommodate their less frequent opportunities for working in the library. The library hours of those sections of the Library most useful for the course, certainly also inadequate for commuting students under traditional methods of teaching, were as follows: The Learning Materials Center was open only until noon on Saturday and only until eight in the evenings, and the government documents library was closed all day Wednesday, the day the course was held. Professors are not allowed to charge out material in a student's name under any circumstances. They are also forbidden to lend material which they have already charged out in their own names. A few very pertinent items, from the government documents collection, were thus lost to some working, commuting students, including hearings on book prices which were of particular interest to a book wholesaler in the class. These items could hardly have been received in time for use in the course if students had themselves ordered them from the government at that time. The central library collection was also of value in providing materials for the course, but weekend library hours were shortened the semester of the study.

The fourth nail bears on the problem of availability of materials, seemingly ever present with traditional methods of teaching, and obviously a more serious one in implementing the

library-college concept, in the sense that the problems which the students investigate constitute the meat of the course; they are not supplementary topics, or more specialized aspects of the subject, as is often the case with term papers.

Whether students require unique items or any appropriate material at all on a subject is, of course, a factor in determining the nature of the collection with respect to multiple copies. Students in the course described needed both. And the relationship of material held by the library to material actually available in the library is a significant one. The basic question relative to the collection boils down to whether the library should support the curriculum, or whether the curriculum should be built around library holdings.

Until the systems approach and such programs as INTREX are in more widespread operation, some compromise will probably be required. For the course under consideration, nine students used other libraries to obtain materials to a great extent, three to a moderate extent, and five none at all. Students also indicated in the questionnaire that the University Library held an estimated average of sixty percent of the materials for which they had found citations in bibliographies. This figure ranged from twenty to one hundred percent. The average estimated percent of these materials which were actually available to them the first time they searched for them on the shelves was also sixty percent. This figure ranged from eight to one hundred percent.

In providing bibliographic guidance for students, in apply-

ing the library-college concept, more direct feedback can be obtained with respect to availability of materials, and collection building will thereby benefit. Such figures as those just cited could be gathered and analyzed with much more accuracy and meaning.

Also related to the availability of materials are the following two difficulties, again a hindrance to carrying out traditional methods of teaching: First, although it is said that the best things in life are free, Rider concluded that the best things in academic life are those which are not yet cataloged or checked in. Rapid availability of incoming material is a necessity in carrying out the library-college concept. Students and faculty who are excited about materials become particularly excited about incoming material, either new or bearing an earlier publication date. Second, when unbound periodicals are used with any degree of frequency, it is very difficult to use them when they are constantly very much out of order. Closed stacks would be preferable, if this measure would insure rapid retrieval of unbound periodicals.

One means by which great improvement might be made in the availability of material, and in more efficient follow-up of unavailable material, is through taking inventory. This practice is, of course, often a by-product of reclassification, but at least one library already using LC, McLaughlin Library of Seton Hall University, South Orange, New Jersey, took inventory in 1966, apparently without undue disruption, as reported in

its "Library Newsletter."[13] Very Reverend William Noe Field, the University Librarian, commented as follows in a letter to Rider dated September 15, 1967: "The inventory had an amazing influence on the Faculty and students, as an appreciation of our desire to serve. Further, the inventory, with all professional and clerical help working together, had an excellent staff result."[14]

In face of the apparently widespread view that taking inventory is outmoded, this Library exercised independent judgment by not making the familiar assumption that the inventory function is fulfilled simply by reordering missing materials reported by library users.

The fifth nail has to do with circulation policy and procedure: the policy regarding personal faculty responsibility for materials charged out from the library for classroom use and the procedure for discharging materials, both problems with traditional teaching methods, but aggravated by the increased use of materials associated with the library-college concept. Such materials as back issues or duplicates of selection aids, made available for laboratory use in the classroom, or phonograph records and transparency sets used during class sessions, should be charged out to the university department involved and not personally to the faculty member who uses the material in the classroom.

On the other hand, materials used by faculty other than in the classroom should, of course, be charged to them personally.

An observation based on Rider's personal experience during the semester is that a system whereby receipts are issued for returned materials might well save the time of librarians and library borrowers in the long run in tracing materials on overdue notices, both which the borrower has returned and which he thinks he returned but did not. More important, such a system would provide the user with proof for returned material which he is held responsible for returning. It is time-consuming to watch continuously for the reappearance of books which have been returned but which are not on their place on the shelves; conversely, use of receipts would also eliminate disagreements concerning the return of material. The borrower must either show his receipt or pay for the material charged to him. He would sign an agreement to this effect the first time he borrows material. Responsibility for obtaining the receipt would rest on the borrower. As automated circulation systems are perfected, they may be able to provide receipts quickly as part of the systems' design.

The sixth nail pertains to the use of reserve materials, a problem involved in traditional teaching methods. Use of reserve materials is not ordinarily associated with the library-college concept. However, Rider found that those materials which were to be read by the whole class were best placed on reserve. The course combined a great deal of individual non-reserve reading with the use of reserve material. Rider would

make less use of the reserve system in teaching the course this way again but would not eliminate it entirely. Eleven students reported on the questionnaire that various problems in using reserve material hampered their work with the material, to a serious extent in eight of the eleven cases.

These problems centered around inability of the student assistants at the Reserve Desk to locate the material and the location of the reserve material up at the Reserve Desk instead of in the Learning Materials Center, with the necessity to charge out each item individually. Rider had inquired about placing materials on reserve in the Learning Materials Center but was informed that they could only be placed on open reserve with the strong possibility of their being lost. The librarian in charge of the Reserve Desk up in the University Library advised Rider against using open reserve there and instead placed his material on closed reserve for the same reason. One student, however, gave this intriguing answer to the question concerning what problems were met in using the reserve material: "None - friends."

The seventh, and last, horse shoe nail bears on the testing and letter grade system, which, in Rider's opinion, is also inappropriate for use with traditional teaching methods. This would require a study in itself, however. Rider concluded that evaluation of students' performance in the course would have lent itself much more appropriately to descriptions, written in collaboration with librarians, relative to

criteria against which students' work would have been evaluated. In such a system of evaluation, these criteria should be made known to the students from the start of the course. Students should be appraised of their progress periodically, in conferences with librarians and faculty, relative to the established criteria. Rider regretted that there was not more time to involve students in evaluation of their own work and that of their fellow students. There was some indication that such activity would be very beneficial in helping students see themselves as others see them more effectively and would also be very well received by the students.

In spite of these factors, described as horse shoe nails, want of which seriously militated, in their cumulative effect, against successful implementation of the concept, the semester's experiences also yielded other general theses.

The first predicts that implementation, even when necessarily conducted as an obstacle course, will reveal so much basic worth in the concept that its eventual theoretical development will pose no problem. A basis for setting forth this thesis must be derived from a consideration of the degree to which the objectives of the course, expressed in terms of desired learning outcomes, were fulfilled and of the degree to which use of the concept as a teaching method influenced fulfillment of the objectives.

Fulfillment of all the objectives suffered to a certain extent from the lack of lead time provided for both students

and Rider to accustom themselves to the library-college approach. Students expressed some bewilderment at the start of the course, and it took Rider until approximately the middle of the term to acquire a reasonably firm grasp on the skill of guiding them in this manner. Nevertheless, in the long run, neither the students nor Rider were any the worse for wear.

Two of the characteristics of the library-college approach, the provision of more extensive bibliographic guidance for students and a closer relationship between students' library activity and classwork, appeared to influence strongly successful fulfillment of the first objective: familiarity with the literature of the subject and effective use of the literature in gaining understanding of the subject. All seventeen students replied in the questionnaire that they felt they would be able to make better use of the literature of librarianship in the future, and sixteen stated that a clear picture began to emerge of the types of material available in librarianship and how to approach it. Only three checked that they already had gained facility in using the literature of librarianship prior to the course, but all three added that they received substantial gain in this ability as a result of the course. All seventeen students said that they saw the relationship of their topic to the total structure of the vast subject content of library materials.

Students demonstrated what Rider called a "sense of re-

sources" in that they placed anything and anybody, consulted in preparing their reports, in the same category, whether located inside or outside the library, regarding them all as resources. The letters received from Herbert Goldhor and Dan Lacy which two students cited, newspaper clippings, filmstrips, librarians visited, class speakers, curriculum guides, and the book and supply wholesaler in the class - all were spoken of as resources as naturally as though they were books and journals.

With respect to making effective use of the literature in gaining understanding of the subject, Rider judged that students incorporated bibliographic activity into their work far more effectively than students in any other of his undergraduate courses. The report which received the most favorable reaction from the students was the one which most successfully incorporated both the original thinking of the student and the thinking expressed in source materials. One report, however, which was overdocumented, provoked this comment from one student: "What do we gain by endlessly quoting from other people?"

All of the written reports, with one exception, appeared truly to represent the students' own thinking and interaction with the subject, to varying degrees. Prior to this course, students' papers typically did not reflect their own manner of speaking and thinking but often contained parts, sometimes copied word for word, from sources which may or may not have been included in their bibliographies. The papers from this course were, therefore, very refreshing. Rider had worked with

the student whose paper was an exception from the time when there first was indication that the student was failing to grasp the idea of the project, but to no avail. Citations in the paper, neatly footnoted, did not always match the sources to which they were ascribed. Several word for word quotations were from a source not listed in the bibliography and were either ascribed in the footnotes to another source or were not cited in a footnote.

It was unfortunate that lack of time and meeting only once a week made it impossible for Rider to go over the students' reports just before presentation. In spite of the help given students in connection with their progress reports and in conferences, their reports were at times not sufficiently concise. Guiding students closely in regard to both preparation and delivery of their reports is necessary to insure that teaching responsibility is not shifted to students during periods or partial periods devoted to student reporting and to insure that the student receives maximum benefit from this teaching method.

Several other characteristics of the library-college approach - student-initiated inquiry and student involvement, practical relevance to the subject treated, and enthusiasm - appeared to influence strongly successful fulfillment of the next two objectives: some ability to select materials (of all kinds, in all subject disciplines) and to handle the technical aspects of ordering; and some ability to perceive and analyze

problems relevant to library materials. Rider was very much satisfied with results of tests and with class discussions, both of which measured fulfillment of these objectives. Fifteen of the students stated in the questionnaire that the course helped them to build self-confidence in regard to selecting materials.

Students showed a great deal of initiative and originality in formulating and attacking their problems, especially in planning visits to libraries and relating their observations and the comments of the librarians to the problems. The nineteen students visited thirty-one different libraries to investigate pertinent selection policies and procedures and rated these visits as a very rewarding aspect of the course. Librarians in these libraries gave generously of their time to the students and communicated with them in a manner which had a very fine effect on their morale, thus countering the individual student's earlier comment about the librarians who seemed not to want to be interrupted to answer a question. This same student, interestingly enough, found the librarians whom she visited in connection with investigation of the problem to be highly cooperative.

Student involvement as evidenced in class discussions was high in both quantity and quality and superior to that observed by Rider in teaching any other undergraduate courses. Their comments were often very penetrating but did not reach this level until Rider insisted that students stop probing, at

which they are expert, for what answer they thought Rider wanted them to give, when questions not yet settled in the field were involved. Academic freedom for students is inherent in inquiry and therefore inherent in the library-college concept. After the very first class presentations, it was found that students required some training in listening, which Rider provided briefly.

In regard to practical relevance to selection, students' approach to the selection function appeared to strike a happy balance between the level-headed and the idealistic. Their library visits undoubtedly played a great part in enabling them to strike this balance. Students raised their observations and the comments of the librarians to a theoretical level and, conversely, tempered theoretical assumptions in the light of these visits. Five students stated in the questionnaire, however, that the course was too theoretical; for the remaining twelve the combination of the theoretical and the practical was "about right". One wrote, "Have already used many ideas gained."

With respect to enthusiasm, students demonstrated this quality to a far greater degree than Rider had previously observed in any other of his undergraduate courses. Students came alive, so to speak, interacting and grappling with the course in a personal way. Typically, a number of students remained some time after class, which ran through supper time, for further discussion. And if success of a course can be

measured by the exhaustion felt by the professor, this course was a raging success.

One final question, relating to all of the course objectives, and taken from The Appraisal of Teaching in Large Universities, was asked in the questionnaire: "What changes in your views, understandings, and knowledge have resulted from this course? Has it made any real difference in how you think or what you hope to do?"[15] - to which Rider added: "Was this course an intellectual experience?" Students answered this question in essay form and did not necessarily stick to the exact questions. Only one response was entirely negative: "This course was not an intellectual experience of any kind." Six other negative comments appeared. All except one were attributable to lack of one of the horse shoe nails mentioned above. The exception had to do with temperature control in the classroom.

Six students stated specifically that the course was an intellectual experience; seven that they received a broader concept of the vastness of the area of selection. A few other specific comments, each from a different student, follow. They reflect as a whole the influence of the library-college approach on the outcome described:

> "My project has more or less put me in the position to want to attend graduate library school."
>
> "Made me think about the subject."
>
> "Much was learned from fellow students."
>
> "Gained a great store of knowledge."

"A most enjoyable course."

"I enjoyed the class and learned a great deal."

"This course was an intellectual experience because of the way the course was set up and also because of fellow students."

"The frustration of deciding on a problem, deciding how to begin, etc. are all worth it when one gets a feeling of having started a worthwhile project.... The vast field of library work as it is building up is inspiring."

"The course was an intellectual experience in a backwards sort of way as each topic caused me seriously to think of what truly would be involved in being a librarian."

With respect to the presence of the book and supply wholesaler in the class: "It rounds out the picture - seeing both sides of the relationship!"

A comment on Rider's teaching which he in turn attributes to the flexibility inherent in the library-college approach: "Knows how to teach not only library minors but also how to help those who aren't even in the field."

And Rider's favorite: "In January I came in ignorant - June I walk out enlightened."

The thesis that librarians will begin to play their role in implementing the library-college concept when they become aware of efforts on the part of faculty in this regard has been treated earlier in the paper as one of the specific questions concerning which Rider sought insights through the study. Reason for believing that this might be the case was given.

The thesis that scattered attempts by faculty to implement the library-college concept will make wide ripples in educational waters was not derived from direct evidence supplied by the semester's experiences but is included as a corollary of the preced-

ing thesis. If even one faculty member has created interest in the concept on the part of the librarians, other faculty desiring to implement this concept will find the librarians already familiar with and perhaps committed to it. Rider suspects, too, that one faculty member will interest another in implementing the concept. An English professor to whom Rider described his efforts remarked that her best teaching consists of helping students in the library when she passes through and sees them there, and that she wished she could teach all her students in the library. She referred to guiding students in their bibliographic work as the heart of teaching. How many other professors might there be who would show themselves receptive to the concept?

The remaining thesis is an outgrowth of the other three general theses just discussed: that if widespread implementation of the library-college concept fails, it will fail only for the want of a horse shoe nail.

Summary and Conclusion

An attempt was made by one professor to implement the library-college concept in an upperclass course, Library Materials, during the spring, 1967, semester in a small university. There was no known immediate readiness on the part of the university administration or the library staff to implement the concept, even in part. The professor combined within himself the roles of professor and librarian. The teach-

ing method used incorporated the following characteristics of the concept: provision of more extensive bibliographic guidance for students, a closer relationship between students' library activity and classwork, student-initiated inquiry and student involvement, practical relevance to the subject treated, and enthusiasm. There is no available documented account of any of the traditional offerings of the course. The insights gained from this experience are presented as suggested hypotheses for further study, to be refined by others who similarly attempt to implement the concept, in different courses, in various other academic institutions.

The central thesis derived from the semester's experiences is that the major threat to successful implementation of the library-college concept lies not in the lack of a general theory, but in the lack of properly allocated resources for operations supporting traditional methods of teaching, which operations play an even greater part in implementing the library-college concept than they play in the use of traditional methods. The difficulties and inconveniences arising from factors, no bigger than a horse shoe nail, in their extrinsic relation to the essence of the concept, and which are subjects of improper allocation of resources, threaten, in their cumulative effect, to turn implementation of the concept into an obstacle course. These factors have to do with time for implementing the concept, adequate scheduling, library hours, availability of materials, cirulation policy and procedure, use of reserve materials, and the

testing and letter grade system.

In spite of these factors, the semester's experiences also yielded other general theses. Use of the library-college concept as a teaching method appeared to influence strongly the successful fulfillment of the objectives of the course, from which influence was derived the following general thesis: that implementation of the library-college concept, even when necessarily conducted as an obstacle course, will reveal so much basic worth in the concept that its eventual theoretical development will pose no problem.

Favorable reaction of the librarians throughout the semester formed the basis of the following general thesis: that librarians will begin to play their role in implementint the library-college concept when they become aware of efforts on the part of faculty in this regard, and its corollary: that scattered attempts by faculty to implement this teaching me thod will make wide ripples in educational waters. The final general thesis is a consequence of the others: that if widespread implementation of the library-college concept fails, it will fail only for the want of a horse shoe nail.

Insight into certain specific questions and their solutions was sought throughout the semester. Relative to the question of the extent to which students and faculty need bibliographic service, the nature of the service required, and in what form it might be provided, the following insights were

obtained: The need for bibliographic guidance on the part of both students and faculty is so great that it invalidates the statement found here and there in the literature that there would be no shortage of professional librarians if the clerical work they are doing were given to clerks.

Analysis of the nature of the bibliographic guidance required by students in the course revealed that guidance in acquiry and inquiry could not be neatly separated, which fact strongly suggests that the roles of librarians and professors in providing this guidance should move toward convergence, with involvement of both in guiding students in inquiry as well as acquiry. Guiding students closely in regard to both preparation and delivery of their reports is necessary to insure that teaching responsibility is not shifted to students during periods or partial periods devoted to student reporting and to insure that the student receives maximum benefit from this teaching method.

The professor's greatest need was for some means by which librarians might have kept him informed of all incoming material, of all types, bearing both on the course in general and on all topics treated by the students. A concomitant need was for some means to obtain these materials to study them before they were made available to students.

Bibliographic guidance might best be performed for students through conferences, and for both students and faculty,

through a current awareness service and a delivery service to faculty offices, student carrels, and mailboxes of commuting students.

In regard to the question of the roles of librarians and faculty in providing bibliographic guidance for students, the roles of each must tend toward much greater convergence, but both roles should not be played by one individual. Reasons for the distinction in role derive from the nature of a library collection as an organized, bibliographic whole and from practical problems. Librarians should assume the role of materials specialists, working in close collaboration with faculty as a teaching team, in guiding students in both acquiry and inquiry, according to the librarian's subject specialties. Faculty should assume the roles of teaching specialists with a specialty in the development of objectives, content, methodology, and evaluation, working in close collaboration with librarians as a teaching team. The following question raised itself: Are these the same roles librarians and faculty have claimed all along, but never really played, or are these new roles?

With respect to the last question pertaining to how professors can implement the library-college concept in their courses, in situations where there is no known readiness on the part of the college administration or the library staff to implement the concept, even in part, the following insight was gained: There was indication that the librarians in the

University Library associated with the study would gradually become openly committed to the concept and assume their appropriate role. Whether or not the reaction of these librarians was a typical one to the efforts of a professor to implement this teaching method must be determined, of course, by further testing in many other situations.

Professors can, in the meantime, play the roles of both librarian and professor, but not as effectively as possible, because they lack the vantage point of the librarian in providing bibliographic guidance, which vantage point consists of (a) selecting, handling, organizing, and retrieving materials of various types as a full-time specialty, (b) seeing the overall picture of the availability of materials, especially with respect to overlapping fields, (c) being physically located at the point where materials come into the library to be integrated into the collection, and (d) operating within an administrative structure which permits the establishment of necessary work routines and time schedules.

Conclusion

The poet tells us that the battle in the rhyme was lost for the want of a horse shoe nail, implying, of course, that the battle was really lost because someone along the line did not put the nail in the shoe. The poet does not tell us whether it was through negligence, however unwitting, that the person

responsible for putting the nail in the shoe failed to do so, or whether there were circumstances beyond his control which prevented his doing so. And it is just as well that the poet does not tell us, for the battle would have been lost either way, and it is the outcome that matters. In order to have won the battle, either the person would have had to shoulder his responsibility, if he was negligent, or some other agent, not controlled by adverse circumstances, would have had to supply and put the nail in the shoe.

Bernier goes on to state in the quotation paraphrased early in the paper: "Adequate resources are not usually allocated properly because the actual and potential values of information services are not fully understood in a motivating way. As a result, information services and systems are still on the sandlots when they should be in the majors."[16] Responsibility falls, of course, on librarians and faculty to make those responsible for allocating resources understand in a motivating way the actual and potential values of information services for supporting implementation of the library-college concept. Thus, resources for operations supporting traditional methods of teaching, which operations play an even greater part in implementing the library-college concept, will more likely be properly allocated.

If librarians and faculty have been negligent, however unwittingly, in communicating effectively with those who allocate resources, with respect to the vital nature of biblio-

graphic services, or if they wish to further their efforts in this regard, they might ponder the applicability to libraries of the philosophy in the song, "It's what you do with what you've got." Faculty might make even greater efforts to collaborate with librarians in making assignments which are possible to carry out with present library holdings, at the same time making known their needs for further bibliographic services to both librarians and academic administrators.

Librarians might review the area which was being studied by the department heads of the University Library associated with this study: supervision. In just such an effort to take stock and determine whether the Library was doing all it could with the resources at hand, in view of inadequate personnel, the Head Librarian spoke of the supervision function at a staff meeting and recommended that department heads read on the subject and discuss it among themselves to clarify in their minds the true nature of supervision. Because the supervision function has at times been abused in many different institutions, and in view of present-day emphasis on individual freedom, the positive values of supervision, when properly done, are likely to be forgotten. Expert use of presently allocated resources may serve as a basis for assuring expert use of additional resources which may be granted.

In addition, faculty and librarians might consider whether

there is any useful carry-over from the advice sometimes offered by preachers, on the subject of world peace, that peace within individuals is the basis of worldwide peace. This emphasis on the role of the individual might well have carry-over to implementation of the library-college concept. Conferences at which pilot projects might be planned will depend on the contributions of the individuals present to determine the direction of the conference, individuals who have done prior thinking and experimenting in regard to implementation of the concept.

It may first be necessary for interested individuals to create a climate for experimentation on the campus. Or there may already exist a climate for experimentation, within which framework the library-college concept might be introduced. Such was the climate on the campus where this experiment took place. Commitment in a personal way to the actual and potential values of bibliographic services and to implementation of the concept may serve as a basis for inspiring the same commitment in those who allocate resources.

If, on the other hand, librarians and faculty together should possibly be unable to implement the library-college concept because of adverse circumstances over which they have no control, in spite of sophisticated communication with those who allocate resources, and if faculty should possibly desire to use this teaching method strongly enough, some other agent, not controlled by adverse circumstances, would have to imple-

ment the concept. Unfortunately, teaching departments might create small departmental libraries, staffed by nonprofessionals, offering bibliographic service to students and faculty, including a current awareness service. Such an arrangement would be an unsatisfactory solution, compared to going through the proper channel of the library, which alone can offer bibliographic service given by materials experts, linking the teaching departments with the library by bringing service into the departments.

Implementation of the library-college concept risks failure, all for the want of a horse shoe nail. Is that nail made of iron? Or of flesh and blood?

References

1. Iona and Peter Opie, comps., The Oxford Nursery Rhyme Book (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963), p. 116. By permission of the Clarendon Press, Oxford.

2. Robert Jordan, "The Library-College - A Merging of Library and Classroom," The Library-College, ed. by Louis Shores, Robert Jordan, and John Harvey (Philadelphia: Drexel Press, 1966), p. 56.

3. Charles L. Bernier, "Allocation of Information Resources; Implications for Education," Proceedings, Symposium on Education for Information Science, Airlie House, 1965, ed. by Laurence B. Heilprin, Barbara E. Markuson, and Frederick L. Goodman (Washington: Spartan Books, 1965), p. 41.

4. Clarence Leuba, "Relations of College Faculty with Librarians in the Library College" (paper read at the Conference on the Library College; A Method of Learning, Philadelphia, December 18-21, 1966), p. 4.

5. Patricia B. Knapp, An Experiment in Coordination Between Teaching and Library Staff for Changing Student Use of University Library Resources (Detroit: Monteith College, Wayne State University, 1964), Section III, p. 4.

6. Arthur W. Combs, "What Can Man Become?" The Self in Growth, Teaching, and Learning (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1965), p. 569.

7. Florence E. DeHart, The Application of Special Library Services and Techniques to the College Library (dissertation, Rutgers - The State University, New Brunswick, N. J., 1964)

8. Elizabeth E. Hamer, "68th Meeting of the Association of Research Libraries," ACRL News, 7:131, October, 1966.

9. Charles H. Davis, "SDI: A Program for Public Libraries," American Documentation, 18:141, July, 1967.

10. Quotation from "Comments on the Three 'Books by Mail' Working Papers," comp. by Robert Jordan. (Sent to the participants in the Conference on Books by Mail, San Francisco, June 24-25, 1967), p. 7.

11. Florence E. DeHart, "The Application of Special Library Services and Techniques to the College Library," College and Research Libraries, 27:132, March, 1966.

12. "State Professors' Work Weeks Average 54 Hours," The Milwaukee Journal, March 15, 1967, p. 14.

13. "Library Newsletter," McLaughlin Library, Seton Hall University, South Orange, N. J., 7:1, November, 1966.

14. Very Reverend William Noé Field, University Librarian, Seton Hall University, South Orange, N. J., letter to Florence E. DeHart, September 15, 1967.

15. Paul Dressel, "The Current Status of Research on College and University Teaching," The Appraisal of Teaching in Large Universities; a report of a conference held at the University of Michigan, October 13-14, 1958 (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan, 1959), p. 14.

16. Bernier, op. cit.